Educational Measures Needs Assessment Meeting

Department of Educational Research

American Printing House

April 19-20, 1983

Bill Duckworth
Meeting Coordinator

Pamphlet File
Research Library
APH

4.2.83

Educational Measures Needs Assessment Meeting

April 19-20, 1983

The purpose of this meeting was to identify and prioritize needs within the area of Educational Measures. In conjunction with this quest, commercial educational measures were reviewed and discussed in an attempt to identify evaluative instruments that could be adapted to satisfy the prioritized needs for the evaluation of the visually handicapped.

Those present from the Educational Research Staff were Bill Duckworth and June Morris.

Guest consultants were:

Don Adamshick	Ohio State School for the Blind
Sarah Ashman	Indiana State School for the Blind
Joan Chase	Rutgers Medical School, New Jersey
Phil Grise'	Assessment Section, State of Florida
Anne Hayes	Tennessee School for the Blind

Several steps were taken prior to the meeting. The first process included the query of major test publishers to identify those tests most widely used nationally. Those tests unknown to the APH staff were ordered for review prior to the meeting. Next, all guest consultants were asked to determine tests thought to be adaptable and which they felt to reflect need in the area. Additionally, an appeal for a listing of tests that should be considered at the meeting was inserted in APH NOTES. Finally, Bill Duckworth attended the National Association of School Psychologists Annual Meeting in order to attend two sessions regarding the assessment of the visually handicapped so as to survey this group for their expressed needs in educational assessment. While response was somewhat limited to all of these requests, it was felt that a good sampling was obtained in this manner, and did provide a good basis for the meeting.

The meeting began with the consultants being provided with the prioritized list of areas of established needs in the previous needs assessment meeting. This included the research and development which had taken place within each of the areas. Discussion was held concerning a development scale, an auditory discrimination measure, a mechanical aptitude scale, and a performance measure. These four were areas where no instrument was found for effective adaptation or where research had indicated that effective tools already existed that could be used with our population with little adaptation needed.

Following this, commercial tests and descriptions of commercial tests were studied by the individual consultants. A review of each test under consideration was written by each consultant using evaluation worksheets provided. This activity led to further discussion.

June Morris requested discussion on points which often create confusion and disagreement in braille testing. The group considered: (1) How open answers, such as a blank to be filled in, should be handled in the testing situation. The consensus was that the teachers supplemental directions for administering should include the instructions for the student to use his brailler in this case. (2) How, and to what extent, should scheduled (e.g. bus), forms (e.g. income tax), and reference forms (e.g. indexes) be adapted. The consensus was that unrealistic forms should be omitted and that some forms, such as an index, should be edited to fit the braille page. (3) If traffic signs, and like visual displays, should be reproduced in braille. The consensus was that those displays that could not be used by the blind be omitted. It was suggested that a substitution, such as elevator brailling, brailled building directories, and the like might be used. (4) What format

could be used for money? The consensus was that real money should be used when possible. The added comment was given that when the tactile representation of monèy was used it should be labeled as to denomination.

In the area of large type the point was made that pictures of coins and bills should not be blown up. Rather, large type words labeling the denomination should be used.

A final demonstration was given by Joan Chase on the Tactile Assessment of Performance presently being developed by Joan. This battery is being developed to accompany the Wechsler Intelligence Scale.

From the discussion and investigation, five need areas were identified and prioritized. They are needs for:

1. Pre-school developmental scales.
2. An individually administered achievement test that does not utilize multiple choice format.
3. Pre-vocational and career educational diagnostic instruments.
4. Instruments for the diagnosis of learning disabilities, especially reading disabilities.
5. An instrument for the evaluation of mechanical aptitude. If a tactile test is impossible then emphasize large type adaptation. While this ties in with pre-vocational, it will be separate area of investigation.

Attachments are:

A. Agenda for the needs meeting.

B. List of commercial tests reviewed.

C. Participants of the meeting

D. Test adaptation worksheet.

Attachment A

A G E N D A

Meetings on Test Needs

April 18, 19, 20, 1983

April 18, 1983

9:15- 4:00	Full day meeting on the Chase Performance Battery--See Participant list.

April 19, 1983

9:00- 9:30	Coffee and expense voucher discussion.
9:30-10:00	Review of accomplishments resulting from last needs meeting of academic measures.
10:00-10:30	Reaction of participants to these endeavors.
10:30-11:00	Review of Monday's meeting on the Chase Performance Battery--Joan Chase.
11:00-12:00	Review of tests proposed by psychologists and commercial test companies.
12:00- 1:00	Lunch arranged at the Inn.
1:00- 1:30	History and process of test adaptation at APH--June Morris.
1:30- 4:00	Review tests individually and evaluate on prepared work sheets.
4:00- 5:00	Break
5:00	Meet at Inn check-in desk for transportation to June Morris's house.
6:00	Dinner at Cafe Metro!

April 20, 1983

9:00- 9:30	Coffee
9:30-10:00	Discussion of related adaptation aspects resulting from test review.
10:00-12:00	Review of individual tests . . .

April 20, 1983 (continued)

12:00- 1:00	Lunch arranged at the Inn.
1:00- 3:00	Review of individual tests . . .

1983
TOP SELLING ACADEMIC TESTS
AS REPORTED BY THE MARKETING CORPORATIONS
& FROM RESPONSES TO SURVEY

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, University of Iowa, Riverside Publishing Company.

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Riverside Publishing Company.

The Cognitive Abilities Test, Riverside Publishing Company.

Tests of Achievement and Proficiency, Riverside Publishing Company.

Nelson-Denny Reading Test, The Riverside Publishing Company.

Peabody Individual Achievement Test, American Guidance Service.

Minnesota Spatial Relations Test, American Guidance Service.

Pennsylvania Bi-Manual Work Sample, American Guidance Service.

Minnesota Rate of Manipulation Tests, American Guidance Service.

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests, American Guidance Service.

Primary Education Program (PEP), Mafex Associates, Inc.

Southern California Sensory Integration Tests, Western Psychological Services.

Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery, Teaching Resources.

Diagnostic Mathematics Inventory, CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Prescriptive Reading Inventory, CTB/McGraw-Hill.

California Achievement Tests, CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Diagnostic Reading Scales, CTB/McGraw-Hill.

Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration, Follett Publishing Company.

Singerland Screening Tests for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability, Educators Publishing Service.

Brigance Inventory of Early Development B-7, Curriculum Associates.

Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills, K-9, Curriculum Associates.

Brigance Inventory of Essential Skills, 4-12, Curriculum Associates.

High School Placement Test, Scholastic Testing Service.

Diagnostic Skills Battery, Scholastic Testing Service.

Educational Development Series, Scholastic Testing Service.

Assessment of Basic Competencies Series, Scholastic Testing Service.

Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude, Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing.

APH Criteria for Test Adaptation

1. The tests fall within need areas identified by the advisory group.
2. The tests fall within the priority areas identified by the advisory group.
3. The tests present no insurmountable obstacles to adaptation (e.g., necessity for excessive redrawing of graphics for large type or inclusion of pictorial material not feasible for tactile reproduction for braille).
4. Publishers of tests will give permission for adaptation.
5. Original standardization data are available in such form to enable them to be applied where necessary.

Attachment C

Consultants on the Chase Tactile Test of Performance, April 18, 1983.

Joan Chase
University of Medicine
Rutgers Medical School
Busch Campus
Piscataway, N.J. 08854
(201) 463-4679

Sarah Ashman
Indiana School for the Blind
7725 North College Avenue
Indianapolis, IN 46240
(317) 253-1481

Emerson Foulke
Perceptual Alternatives Laboratory
Belknap Campus
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40292
(502) 588-6722

Ronald Sims
Fairfield Special Services Center
10th Avenue and Bruce Street
Huntington, WV 25701
(304) 525-9451
(8-8-924-1511)

David Herman
Measurement Division
Psychological Corporation
757 3rd Avenue
New York, NY 10017
(212) 888-3140

June Morris
APH
(502) 895-2405, ext. 319

Bill Duckworth
APH
(502) 895-2405, ext. 332

Carson Nolan
APH
(502) 895-2405, ext. 240

Consultans on Educational Measures Needs Meeting, April 19, 20, 1983.

June Morris

Bill Duckworth

Joan Chase

Sarah Ashman

Anne Hayes
Tennessee School for the Blind
115 Stewarts Ferry Pike
Nashville, TN 37214
(615) 885-2451

Don Adamshick
Ohio State School for the Blind
5220 North High Street
Columbus, OH 43214
(614) 888-3913

Phil Grise'
State of Florida
Department of Education
Assessment Section
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-8198

Attachment D

TEST ADAPTATION WORKSHEET

TEST: COMMITTEE MEMBER

FORM: _____

LEVEL OR GRADE:

COMPANY:

PUBLISHING DATE:

AREA OR SKILL MEASURES: (Comments, such as adequacy of measurement)

PROBLEMS IN ADAPTING TO BRAILLE: (e.g., items that would be dropped: problem graphs, pictures, visual oriented items, etc.)

PROBLEMS IN ADAPTING TO LARGE PRINT:

DIAGNOSTIC USES, HOWEVER SLIGHT: (in terms of I.E.P.'s for instance)

RATIONALE FOR OR AGAINST ADAPTATION OF THIS PARTICULAR TEST:

GENERAL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS: